



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,068	08/20/2003	Hisashi Nakamura	031016	4352
38834	7590	05/16/2006	EXAMINER	
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP			XIAO, KE	
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 700				2629
WASHINGTON, DC 20036				

DATE MAILED: 05/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/644,068	NAKAMURA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ke Xiao	2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/14/2006</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizoguchi (US 5,841,466) in view of Ito (US 2001/0021979).

Regarding **Claims 1 and 2**, Mizoguchi teaches a liquid crystal projector (Mizoguchi, Figs. 2 and 3, elements 8 and 22) comprising:

an operation unit for operating a liquid crystal projector (Mizoguchi, Fig. 4 elements 30-32);

a circuit for previously registering a password (Mizoguchi, Fig. 4 element 30, Col. 2 line 63 - Col. 3 line 13);

a circuit for entering, in a case where the pass word is registered, a password when the power to the liquid crystal projector is turned on (Mizoguchi, Figs. 2 and 4 element 3, 5 and 14, Col. 3 lines 13-65); and

a circuit for comparing the entered password with the register password and making it possible to operate the liquid crystal projector by the operation unit only

when both the passwords coincide with each other (Mizoguchi, Figs. 1 and 4 element 30, Col. 3 lines 13-65).

Mizoguchi fails to teach a determining circuit to determine a number of times an erroneous password is entered as claimed. Ito teaches determining a number of times an erroneous password is entered and to inhibit operation of a device in response to determining that the number of times an erroneous password is entered exceeds a predetermined number of times (Ito, Pg. 9 paragraph [0153]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add an additional circuit to determine a number of times an erroneous password is entered and to inhibit operation of the display of Mizoguchi in response to determining that the number of times an erroneous password is entered exceeds a predetermined number of times as taught by Ito in order to prevent an unauthorized user from guessing at the password repeatedly.

Regarding **Claims 3 and 4**, Mizoguchi teaches a liquid crystal projector system for regulating use of a liquid crystal projector (Mizoguchi, Fig. 2 element 5), comprising:

an external computer for operating the liquid crystal projector, the external computer being connected to the liquid crystal projector by radio or wire and including liquid crystal projector controlling software for controlling the liquid crystal projector (Mizoguchi, Fig. 3 element 8 and 22);

the liquid crystal projector comprising:

an operation unit for operating the liquid crystal projector (Mizoguchi, Fig. 4 elements 30-32);

a circuit for registering a password in the liquid crystal projector (Mizoguchi, Fig. 4 element 30);

a determining unit to determine whether a password is registered in the liquid crystal projector in response to a power supply of the liquid crystal projector being turned on (Mizoguchi, Fig. 1 element S3, Fig. 4 element 30);

a circuit for both inhibiting operation of the liquid crystal projector by the operation means and for waiting until a password is received from the external computer in response to detecting that the password is registered in the liquid crystal projector (Mizoguchi, Fig. 1 S14-S17, Fig. 4 elements 3, 5 and 30); and

a circuit for comparing, in response to receiving the password from the external computer, the received password with the registered password and for allowing operating of the liquid crystal projector by the external computer in response to the means for comparing indicating that both the registered password and the password received from the external computer coincide with each other (Mizoguchi, Fig. 1 S14-S17, Fig. 4 elements 3, 5 and 30).

Mizoguchi fails to teach a determining circuit to determine a number of times an erroneous password is entered as claimed. Ito teaches determining a number of times an erroneous password is entered and to inhibit operation of a device in response to determining that the number of times an erroneous password is entered exceeds a

Art Unit: 2629

predetermined number of times (Ito, Pg. 9 paragraph [0153]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add an additional circuit to determine a number of times an erroneous password is entered and to inhibit operation of the display of Mizoguchi in response to determining that the number of times an erroneous password is entered exceeds a predetermined number of times as taught by Ito in order to prevent an unauthorized user from guessing at the password repeatedly.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 1-4 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ke Xiao whose telephone number is (571) 272-7776. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz can be reached on (571) 272-3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

May 1st, 2006 - kx -



SUMATI LEFKOWITZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER